

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. New claim 29 finds direct support in the Specification as originally filed, for example at paragraph 8 and Figures 1-3. Accordingly no new matter is added.

Because claim 29 is well supported by the Specification as filed, these claims meet the written description requirement of 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

Moreover, claim 29 meets the enablement requirement of 35 USC 112, first paragraph. For example, the Specification unambiguously and with specificity describes the packetization of TDM frames in the manner recited in the claims and provides examples of processes for doing so (see, e.g., Fig. 3). The Office Action seems to want further information regarding the type of information so packetized, however, that level of specificity is not being claimed and so such a requirement is unfounded. Also, the claim recites with specificity which information is written to the destination field of the Ethernet packet and one of ordinary skill in the art would have no difficulty comprehending this operation.

The TDM stream recited in the present application is any data stream modulated in a time division multiplexed fashion, as that label implies. A TDM frame is a well-known component of such a stream. Notice also that it is not destination information from the frame itself that is written to the destination field of the Ethernet packet. Simply destination information which as described in the Specification may be understood to be a particular card of a switch, etc. (see, e.g., paragraph 14). In short, the enablement requirement is met.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP



Tarek N. Fahmi
Reg. No. 41,402

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(408) 947-8200